

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Remarks**

Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-32 remain in the case including independent claims 1, 2, 15, 25, 26, 27, 31, and 32. Claims 1, 2, 15, 25, 26, 27, and 32 are amended.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 15, 25, 27, 28, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 15, 25, 26, 27, and 32 to show that the determination of the rollover potentiality index and the rollover index that is identifiable with the vehicle having a propensity to rollover and is utilized to implement a control action for counteracting an anticipated rollover event which provides a real world meaningful and tangible result. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 15, 25, 26, 27, and 32 should be withdrawn.

In regards to claim 31, applicant notes that claim 31 originally included the limitations of implementing a control action to reduce the propensity of the vehicle to rollover in the event the RPI is greater than a predetermined threshold. The rejection of claim 31 appears to be erroneous as the limitations of implementing the control action for counteracting the anticipated rollover event clearly addressed the Office actions concern. Therefore, the rejection of claim 31 should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 3-12, 14, 16-22, 24, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on dependency is respectfully traversed. The above referenced dependent claims recite added limitations regarding the detailed steps and devices for sensing the vehicle operating parameters and determining the rollover event. In addition, the dependent claims, namely 6-12 and 17-22, recite limitations for control actions that are taken to prevent a potential rollover event from occurring based on the estimation of the propensity of the vehicle to rollover as determined from the independent claim from which it depends. The office action rejected all the claims based on the statutory rejection and gave such reasons that there is no final step of utilizing the rollover potentiality index making it available for use in a meaningful way which would be conveyed to someone or something to be used in a meaningful way to establish a tangible result. To the contrary, dependent claims 6-12 and 17-22 provide such further

(10/719,968)

9

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

limitations of a control action in response to the rollover potentiality index which establishes a tangible result. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6-12 and 17-22 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/5/2006



Frank L. Lollo
Reg. No. 48,854

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
Tel: 734-542-0900
Fax: 734-542-9569

(10/719,968)

10